2016 Citizen Committee Matrix Guidance

**Background:**

The Citizen’s Committee evaluates projects proposed for SRFB funding based on their value to local communities. Participants may represent counties, cities, conservation districts, tribes, environmental groups, business interests, landowners, citizens, volunteer groups, regional fish enhancement groups, and other stakeholder groups.

The Citizen’s Committee ensures that projects identified as biological priorities also have the community support they need to succeed. The committee works together to evaluate how the community’s social, cultural and economic values are incorporated into salmon recovery projects. This is a vital part of ensuring that community support for salmon recovery increases over time.

**Decision Making**

The Citizen’s Committee develops the final ranked funding list that is then submitted to the SRFB for funding. The Citizen’s Committee takes the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) into consideration, but is not obligated to maintain the TAG’s ranking if the Committee determines that the social, cultural and economic values of a project warrant changing its position in the ranked list (see below on page two for criteria for moving projects). The TAG hears project presentations and ranks proposals on the same day, using technical criteria for that purpose. Citizen’s Committee decisions shall be arrived at by a full and open discussion of the alternatives and opinions. Decision making shall be made by consensus of the Workgroup in attendance. Consensus is herein defined as a preponderance of agreement, not unanimous agreement. In all discussions, preference is decision-making by consensus and to that end, every attempt will be made to achieve a unanimous decision. The outcome of all voted decisions shall be recorded in the minutes. Dissenting individuals may submit written opinions of the dissent or disagreement for inclusion in the minutes.

To qualify as a voting member, individuals must attend two meetings prior (or if not the site visit, the meeting prior wherein project proponents present their draft proposals via PowerPoint) to the vote and have reviewed the current year’s 3-year-work-program and the Salmon Habitat Restoration and Protection Plan for WRIA 14. Members of the public are welcome to give comments and ask questions during the annual ranking meeting but may not vote unless they have fulfilled the above requirements.

Each representative, organization, or group shall appoint one person to represent that organization when a vote is called for or necessary. Organizations are however eligible to have a representative on the Citizen’s Committee and another on the Technical Committee, as each committee is responsible for ranking proposals on different and specific criteria. Also, as outlined with RCW 77.85, membership on each committee should represent the local community and include Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups, Tribes, Conservation Districts, non-profits, etc. To the extent possible, voters shall be informed participants, actively involved in the business of the Workgroup. All voting decisions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present. A quorum of members will be one-third of the voting members. These rules do not restrict the number of people who may participate in meetings, merely those who may participate in voting decisions.

If a two-thirds vote fails, the issue will be discussed further until the two-thirds majority can be satisfied. The coordinator will strive to ensure that all members are given opportunity to express their thoughts and will provide additional information as available and necessary to resolve an impasse. If obtaining the two-thirds majority continues to be difficult, Workgroup members can decide to table the issue for later discussion and resolution using the decision making steps outlined in 3.1 of the Process Guide.

Projects may only be moved on the ranked list by the Citizen’s Committee for specific reasons as outlined below:

1. If the last ranking project ranked within the funding allocation is only partially funded and cannot go forward with partial funds and the project below it is able to be implemented with those funds, then the ranking can be altered. Note: PSAR funds can carry forward if the Committee decides not to fund the next project down from the partially funded project;
2. If a project has substantial budgetary or permitting uncertainties remaining even though it is technically sound and supports community values, it may be moved within the ranked list after discussion.

This process is set up to meet the requirements of the state statute creating the SRFB and the Lead Entity program, and is designed to ensure that projects proposed for SRFB funding are technically sound, address priority issues, and are broadly supported by diverse community interests.

**Scoring:**

Citizen’s committee members use the Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix to determine how projects rate for multiple criteria in each of four categories: cultural and social; economic; context and organization; and partnerships and community support. Scores are added to determine an overall positive or negative total for each project.

An annual ranked project list will be established by adding the Z-score for the technical criteria of a specific project to the Z-score of the Citizen’s criteria for that same project. The list will be created by putting the cumulative project scores in descending order. In the case of a tie, the project that received the higher score from the Citizen’s ranking breaks the tie.

**Guidance for Specific Questions:**

**Cultural & Social Benefits**

1. Will the project create benefits for the Squaxin Island Tribe and its members?

*Consider whether the project impacts the protection of cultural resources, access for traditional activities, and other issues of concern to the Squaxin Island Tribe and its members.*

*A statement of priorities from Scott Steltzner:*

*The Squaxin Island Tribe Natural Resources Department supports the salmon habitat protection and restoration strategy adopted by WRIA 14. The Tribe views this document as an important step that will lead to true recovery plans for the WRIA’s ecosystem.*

*The Squaxin Island Tribal Council has mandated that all species and their habitat be recovered to sustainable and harvestable levels. However, the Council recognizes that faced with limited resources prioritization must occur at the species, geographic or project level. Tribal priority species for salmonids which are mirrored in the strategy include chum, coho, cutthroat and steelhead for freshwater systems and chum, coho, cutthroat, steelhead and Chinook for marine waters.*

*The Tribe looks forward to working with our partners at the State and local level in taking the next step of using the information contained in the strategy to devise true ecosystem recovery plans.*

2. Will the project create benefits for the agricultural, aquaculture, or timber industry within the community?

*Consider whether the project changes ESA liabilities for agricultural operations, impacts agricultural infrastructure, impacts adjacent landowners, removes land from agricultural production, or creates other benefits for or issues of concern to the agricultural community. Alternatively, consider if the project changes ESA liabilities for shellfish operations, impacts shellfish infrastructure, impacts adjacent landowners, removes land from shellfish production, or creates other benefits for or issues of concern to the shellfish community. Alternatively, consider if the project changes ESA liabilities for timber operations, impacts timber infrastructure, impacts adjacent landowners, removes land from timber production, or creates other benefits for or issues of concern to the timber industry.*

*Consider these points with the lens that all SRFB / PSAR projects are voluntary and occur with willing landowners.*

3. Will the project create benefits for the community at large?

*Consider whether the project impacts general community interests. Is it highly visible? Is it likely to be broadly supported, or is it potential contentious? Does it have significant non-fish benefits, like improved flood control or improvement of public infrastructure? Does it create any problems for significant parts of the community?*

4. Will the project reduce ESA liabilities for community members?

*Consider whether the project increases or decreases specific parties’ potential liability for ‘take’ under the federal Endangered Species List (defined as harming of a listed species)– for example, installation of fish screen may have a positive impact by reducing potential take by water users who do not have to worry any more about sucking fish into irrigation systems.*

5. Will the project benefit recreational opportunities?

*Consider how the project will affect recreational interests. Does it change access to recreational areas and opportunities to participate in recreational opportunities? Does it create potential risks for recreationalists that need to be addressed (e.g. concerns over the impact of large wood placement on river runners/boaters/floaters).*

6. Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component?

*Consider whether the project proposes to involve students and the public in the project implementation, provide educational signage, serve as sites for outreach events and tours, or otherwise serve as a venue where the public can learn about and become engaged in salmon recovery?*

**Economic Considerations**

7. Is there a potential short-term benefit to the community’s economy?

*Consider whether the project will create jobs during the construction or appraisal phase, create opportunities for local contractors and businesses, and/or negatively impact any local economic interests during the implementation phase.*

8. Is there a potential long-term benefit to the community’s economy?

*Consider whether the long-term presence of the project has economic impacts such as significantly changing to local infrastructure, recreational fishery spending, creating new economic opportunities, or negatively affecting other economic interests. A lower score here reflects negative impacts, while a higher score indicates positive economic benefits.*

9. Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?

*Consider if a proposed budget is too low or too high and if it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend grant funding. A higher point value indicates that a budget appears to be either highly uncertain or unreasonable give what is proposed to be done.*

10. Does the project represent a sound investment of Washington State tax dollars?

*Consider if the proposed cost of the project is reasonable compared with the level of benefit from the expected outcomes? This is a qualitative evaluation of the benefit of the project compared to the cost to SRFB and is not intended to require quantification of benefits.*

**Project Context & Organization**

11. If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost?

*Consider whether a project is ripe and appropriately sequenced. If the project is not funded, would we lose a significant funding match? Project should receive a higher point range if there is a compelling reason for moving forward without delay, and a lower point range if it does not seem ready to move ahead or could wait another year.*

12. Does the project employ methods that are: innovative, standard, or problematic?

*Consider to the methods proposed for implementing a project. A project should receive a higher point range for providing a compelling argument for a new approach that might act as an example for future work, neutral range for a using a typical, well established approach, and a lower point range for proposing outdated or problematic methods.*

13. Is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?

*Consider if the project’s success is dependent upon the sequencing of other projects. A project should receive a higher point range if it is clearly the next step in a series of projects for a reach, and a lower point range if other projects need to be completed before the fish benefits will be realized.*

14. Is there confidence that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?

*Consider the likelihood that the project can ultimately deliver the anticipated fish and habitat benefits, given possible barriers to success. First ask if the project would be likely to be implemented as proposed. Are the proposal and the budget clear and well thought out? Is there evidence of adequate landowner commitment?, etc.). Then ask if the project, if implemented as proposed, is likely to have the anticipated benefits for fish and habitat.*

**Partnerships & Community Support**

15. Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?

*Consider positive/neutral/negative aspects of community/citizen involvement demonstrated in the proposal. A project with strong landowner and stakeholder support, volunteers, technical support from appropriate partners, financial and in-kind contributions, and should receive more points.*

16. Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?

*Consider positive/neutral/negative aspects of the partnerships demonstrated in the proposal. A proposal that demonstrates strong support from multiple stakeholders should receive a closer to 3 points, while a proposal with significant opposition should receive zero or one point*.

17. Is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

*The project should receive a 3 points if the sponsor demonstrates that they are using SRFB monies to leverage significant amounts from other funding sources (only 15% of which needs to be claimed for match within the SRFB or PSAR grant, while PSAR Large Capital does not require match), and/or the sponsor shows that they have received significant in-kind and/or financial support from the landowner or other source not generally dedicated to salmon recovery.*

**WRIA 14 SRFB 2016 Round Citizens Project Reviewer Scoresheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant : | | Project Title: |
| Reviewer: | | Date: |
| TOTAL SCORE: /65 | | RANK: |
| *General Guidance: A higher score equals a greater benefit to salmon.* | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| **Cultural & Social Benefits** | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Will the project create benefits for the Squaxin Island Tribe and   its members? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Will the project create benefits for the agricultural, aquaculture, or timber industry within the community?   (0-3 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Will the project create benefits for the community at large?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Will the project reduce ESA liabilities for community members?   (0-3 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Will the project benefit recreational opportunities? (0-3 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Does the project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE for Cultural & Social Benefits \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Economic Considerations** | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is there a potential short-term benefit to the community’s economy?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is there a potential long-term benefit to the community’s economy?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Does the project represent a sound investment of Washington State   tax dollars?  (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE for Economic Considerations \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Project Context & Organization** | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Does the project employ methods that are: innovative, standard, or problematic? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is the project coordinated and in sequence with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is there confidence that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE for Project Context and Organization \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | |  |
| **Partnerships & Community Support** | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? (0-4 points) | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. Is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?   (0-4 points) | | |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE for Partnerships & Community Support \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | |  |
| **TOTAL PROJECT SCORE:** | | |  |